

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested for the following reasons:

1. Entry After Final Rejection

Entry of the amendments is believed to be appropriate because they merely re-write claims to include subject matter indicated as allowable (cancelling rejected claim 1), and correct informalities noted by the Examiner.

2. Objections to Specification

The objections to the disclosure have been addressed as follows:

- a. The objection to page 4, line 11 to page 5, line 3 has been addressed by changing “LSP counts” has been changed to –LSP parameters–.
- b. The objection to page 5, lines 6-14 has been addressed by re-writing equation 2 so change the second occurrence of “}” to –)–.
- c. The objection to page 19, lines 5-9, set forth in item 3 on page 2 of the Official Action, has been addressed by changing “track 1” to –track 0– (the “1” being a typo introduced in the previous amendment).

In addition, the Examiner’s comment in item 17 on page 10 of the Official Action, concerning use of lower case t to indicate transpose in equation, is noted. Lower case t has been changed to upper case T as suggested by the Examiner.

3. Objections to Claims

The objections to the claims have been addressed as follows:

- a. The objection to claim 5 set forth in item 5a. on page 3 of the Official Action has been addressed by deleting “the” before –detecting and searching processes–, as suggested by the Examiner, and also by amending claim 8 to change “the searching process” to –the searching processes–.

- b. The objection to claim 3 set forth in item 5b. on page 3 of the Official Action has been addressed by changing “the code vector obtaining step” to –obtaining a code vector–, as suggested by the Examiner.
- c. The objection to claim 3 set forth in item 5c. on pages 3-4 of the Official Action has been addressed by adding definitions of  $p$ ,  $p_m$ ,  $L_m$ ,  $M$ , and  $W$ . The added definitions are supported by corresponding definitions on page 5, line 16 to page 6, line 6 of the original specification.
- d. The objection to claim 5 set forth in item 6 on page 4 of the Official Action has been addressed by changing adding –for indexes– after searching processes, as suggested by the Examiner.

4. Various Rejections of Claim 1 based on Prior Art and Double Patenting

These rejections have been rendered moot by:

- a. Amending claim 1 to include the limitations of original claim 2;
- b. Re-writing claim 3 in independent form to include the limitations of claim 1, from which it originally depended.

Having thus overcome each of the rejections made in the Official Action, withdrawal of the rejections and expedited passage of the application to issue is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



By: BENJAMIN E. URCIA  
Registration No. 33,805

Date: October 6, 2006

**Serial Number 09/749,782**

**BACON & THOMAS, PLLC**  
625 Slaters Lane, 4th Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

**Telephone: (703) 683-0500**

NWB\S\Producer\bu\Pending 1...P\KCKANO 749782\402.wpd